

889
68

SPEECH
OF
EDWARD JOY MORRIS,
OF PENNSYLVANIA,
ON THE
REVISION OF THE TARIFF,
AND IN
DEFENCE OF THE PROTECTIVE POLICY.

DELIVERED IN THE U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 2, 1859.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the President's Annual Message—Mr. MORRIS, of Pennsylvania, said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: As a Representative from the largest manufacturing city in the Union, whose production of fabrics amounts to \$150,000,000 per annum, and from a State which, in 1856, produced more than one-half of the whole quantity of iron in the United States, I cannot but feel a deep interest in any measure of legislation relating so directly to our domestic manufactures as the proposed revision of the tariff. Strong, however, as is my feeling on this subject as a State question, it is no less so as one of national import.

The State that I, in part, represent, asks no special favors to the derogation of the claims of other members of the Union. I should be false to the patriotic spirit of my own immediate constituency, as well as to that of Pennsylvania at large, were I, on this floor, to advocate the cause of protection as a local question. It is because its effects have been of equal benefit to all parts of the country; because it has been the main-spring of our prosperity and material independence; and because it promotes the welfare of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, that I stand here to-day to maintain it, as the only safe basis of tariff legislation.

The insufficient revenue yielded by the existing tariff rendering its revision a matter of necessity to the Government, the question arises whether it shall be done with a view to revenue exclusively; whether due regard shall be had to the interests of domestic industry; and whether the policy of protection, which in some form or other, direct or incidental, has always been incorporated with our revenue system, shall be recognized in the proposed revision? The Secretary of the Treasury seems to look to revenue alone, and to be rather disposed to discriminate against the industry of the country, than in its favor. He recommends that the proposed increase of duty shall be levied on articles not of the growth of this country, and on those of domestic origin that come the least into competition with foreign fabrics.

Is there anything in the history of the past to justify the reasoning of the Secretary of the Treasury? Did any of the protective tariffs fail to provide the Government with revenue, or to promote the general interests

of the country? Has not every attempt that has been made to approximate to a system of absolute free trade in the United States been productive of infinite mischief alike to the Government and the people? Are not the most prosperous periods in our history—those in which the Government was amply provided with revenue, and the trade and industry of the country were most flourishing—the periods when the protective policy was in operation?

The protective periods are marked by a steady and equable revenue, as well as by a sound, internal prosperity; while those of comparative free trade are distinguished by extreme fluctuations of the revenue, excessive importations, and financial and business panics of the most disastrous character. It is, sir, also a remarkable fact, that the advocates of free trade themselves have been obliged to retreat from the practical application of their doctrines, whenever they have had even a comparative test in this country.

The war of 1812-'14, with the non-intercourse laws, embargo, and a judicious tariff, had built up our manufactures. The revenue tariff of 1816, while it stimulated a sudden and large increase of revenue, overwhelmed the country with foreign goods, crippled our rising industry, and finally, owing to the impoverishment of the country, the revenue fell off to the inadequate amount of \$15,000,000. The failure of the revenue tariff of 1816 to meet the wants of the country and Government, compelled the readoption of protection to a moderate degree in the tariff of 1824, and to the full extent required by the necessities of the times, in that of 1828. Under the latter act, the prosperity of the country immediately revived, and the revenue gradually rose from \$23,000,000 to \$33,000,000 in 1833, the last year of its existence. That disastrous measure, the compromise act, enacted in this year, and which repudiated protection, while it raised the revenue to \$48,000,000 in one year, reduced it to \$11,000,000 in another year. Under its operation, the country became bankrupt; factories and furnaces were closed; great distress was produced from the want of work; and thousands of the working classes were reduced to beggary and want. The overflowing Treasury of 1836 was exhausted, and it finally left the Government \$54,000,000 in debt. Never was there a more signal failure in legislation than the revenue tariff of 1833.

The protective tariff of 1842, which was created, in obedience to an overruling necessity, to heal the wounds inflicted on the country by free trade, soon fulfilled the expectations of its projectors. The revenue from customs steadily rose from the \$18,000,000 of the last year of the compromise tariff, to \$27,500,000. The credit of the Federal Government, which had been unable to negotiate a loan in Europe at six per cent., was restored. Defaulting States resumed the payment of interest on their debts. The unemployed found labor, at increased wages, in the reopened mills, factories, and furnaces. Railroad and all other stocks, as well as real estate, rose in value, and specie flowed back to us from Europe. There being no artificial stimulus to importation by a low scale of duties, we produced and consumed more at home, and diminished our indebtedness abroad. The consumption of cotton by our home manufactures nearly doubled under the tariff of 1842, while the domestic production of iron increased, in the five years of its existence, from two hundred and thirty thousand tons per annum to eight hundred thousand tons per annum. By this tariff the manufacture of railroad iron, of which not a bar had previously been made in the United States, was called into existence by a protective duty of twenty-five dollars per ton; and, notwithstanding the vicissitudes to which it has since been exposed by vacillating legislation, the encouragement it

then received has enabled it, under great sacrifices, to maintain itself to the present day, when its annual production reaches two hundred thousand tons. The internal commerce rose under the tariff of 1842 from \$108,000,000 to \$146,000,000 per annum. When it was repealed, to give place to the revenue tariff of 1846, it had reëstablished State and national credit, and had filled the country with plenty and prosperity in all its borders. Had that tariff been permitted to exist, the production of railroad iron in the United States would now amount to upwards of a million tons, and at least one-third of the whole cotton crop of the Southern States would be consumed in our own manufactories, creating a rivalry of demand with England, and maintaining it at a steady and remunerative price to the producer.

The tariff of 1842 was not suffered to continue its beneficent career, and was supplanted by the reduced tariff of 1846, which, as its predecessors based on the same principles, promoted inordinate importations to the ruin of domestic industry. The customs in the first seven months of the tariff of 1846, fell off \$2,500,000. In the next year of Irish famine they rose \$8,000,000, varying several millions of increase or decrease every year, until they reached \$63,875,905, in 1856-'57. To deplete an overflowing Treasury, the duties were again reduced under the tariff of 1857. As under previous revenue tariffs, the Government and people, when the mischievous effects of such legislation were fully carried out, were involved in like distress. Millions of capital invested in manufactures have been lost, manufacturing establishments have been obliged to close their doors, and dismiss their operatives, while the revenue of the Government has fallen \$50,000,000 short of its expenditure.

The history of protective legislation carries with it its own vindication, as this review of the past shows; while that of free trade condemns itself. The former affords a sure basis of calculation as to revenue, and is a stable guarantee of prosperity. The latter is a source of embarrassment to trade and revenue; inflating them to an extravagant degree at one time, and depressing them to the lowest pitch at another. Immense land speculations, stock gambling, increased foreign indebtedness, an overflowing national Treasury, and extravagance in all Departments of Government are the characteristics of anti-protective tariffs in the first stages; to be followed as surely, in the end, as the night follows the day, by a general crash in business affairs; a suspension of specie payments, owing to the drain of specie to Europe to pay for the deluge of importations; and by the exhaustion of the Federal Treasury and the creation of a new national debt. Who can estimate the misery inflicted on the workingmen, when, by this anti-American policy of legislation, our domestic industry is sacrificed at one rude blow, and the marts of labor closed; when the American mechanic is suddenly deprived of employment, and his domestic happiness and independence are blighted by a system of legislation that ruins the American manufacturer, and builds up the fortunes of his European rival? I hold it to be one of the highest duties of the American Government to protect the interests of American labor, and to sustain it against foreign competition. Certainly that legislation cannot be just which encourages European labor and industry to our detriment; which prevents the development of our great natural resources and promotes those of Europe.

But we are told, sir, by the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. MILLSON,) that the policy of protection is obsolete, and that it is being abandoned by the leading nations of Europe. I take issue with that gentleman on this subject, and I assert that it was never more in vogue than at present. The culture of the beet-root established by Napoleon I., under the continental system, to render France independent of British sugar, and which has ever

since been protected by defensive duties, now annually yields fourteen or fifteen million dollars, and is extended over more than a hundred thousand acres. Its great production has reduced the price of both the domestic and foreign sugar. Without it, the consumer in France would have been obliged to pay whatever price the foreign producer demanded. It was the boast of Napoleon that he naturalized the manufacture of cotton in France, first by prohibiting the web, and next spun cotton, until he succeeded in firmly establishing the three branches of the cotton manufacture in that country.

The present development of this branch of industry in France sufficiently illustrates the wise forecast of Napoleon, giving employment, as it does, to near three hundred thousand persons, in two thousand and fifty mills and factories, and producing annually nearly sixty million dollars of cotton goods. In the manufacture of laces and embroideries of which cotton forms the chief material, there are 556 establishments. The raw cotton received in France, of which 173,926,744 lbs. came from the United States, in 1856, is increased in value, 350 per cent. by manufacture. Almost all foreign cotton manufactures continue to be prohibited in France, while a bounty of \$15 74 per two hundred and twenty pounds is allowed on the export of cotton hosiery. Gunpowder, fine earthenware, nails and castings, fire-arms for soldiers, bottles, leather, gloves, articles of wrought, sheet, and cast iron, knives, nails, silk, tulle, snuffs, soaps, and many other articles, are prohibited by the French tariff. The high protective character of that tariff, and the jealous care with which the French Government encourages the industry of its people, is yet more clearly demonstrated in the bounties allowed on the export of domestic manufactures. Among the bounties on the export of such articles, it will be sufficient for my purpose to cite the following: On sulphuric acid, \$1 30 per two hundred and twenty pounds; aqua fortis, a similar bounty; soda, 83 4-5 cents per two hundred and twenty pounds; bonnets, of wool or cotton, \$15 74 per two hundred and twenty pounds; carpets, of pure wool, \$18 51 per two hundred and twenty pounds, and those mixed with linen or cotton, \$15 74 for the same weight; bottles, filled or not, 23 cents per two hundred and twenty pounds; large mirrors, 18½ cents per superficial metre; jewelry, the same as import duty; hams, \$4 68 per two hundred and twenty pounds; straw hats, trimmed, 23 cents each; ready-made clothing, the import duty on the raw material.

France has of late, through the President of the Council, M. Baroche, made a public declaration to the world, of her adhesion to the protective policy. In his words, she has determined to—

“Formally reject the principles of free-trade, as incompatible with the independence and security of a great nation, and as destructive of her noblest manufactures. No doubt our customs tariff contains useless, antiquated prohibitions, and we think they must be removed. But protection is necessary to our manufactures. This protection must not be blind, unchangeable, or excessive; but the principle of it must be firmly maintained.”

The Russian tariff prohibits the importation of iron bars and manufactures of iron, refined sugar, gunpowder, &c.; while the duties on cotton goods and other branches of native industry, are such as to exempt them from all danger of being prostrated by foreign competition; to a fair contest with which they are exposed by a reduction of duties, from time to time, carefully graduated to their progress and self-sustaining ability. Free-trade had a fair experiment in Russia, in the tariff of 1819, and its effects were so disastrous that Count Nesselrode, in an official circular of 1821, declared that it was absolutely necessary to abandon it, to save the empire from ruin. In his own words—

“The products of the empire found no market abroad; the manufactures of Russia were ruined, or upon the verge of ruin; the money of the country was being carried off into foreign parts, and the most solid commercial establishments were on the brink of destruction.”

The protective system was consequently adopted :

"Not finding abroad [says List] any market for her products, Russia attempted to solve the reverse of the problem, by bringing the markets near to the products. She established manufactures upon her own domain. The demand for fine wool, occasioned by the woolen manufactures thus created, had the effect of rapidly increasing and improving her sheep husbandry. Commerce at large increased, instead of diminishing under this policy, especially commerce with Persia, China, and other neighboring countries in Asia. Commercial revulsions came to an end; and it suffices to examine the last report of the department of commerce in Russia, to be convinced that Russia owes to that system her high degree of prosperity, and that she is advancing with gigantic strides in a career of wealth and power."

In little more than a quarter of a century, Russia, under the genial influence of a wise system of protective duties, has become one of the chief manufacturing nations of Europe. The annual value of her manufactures is estimated at the sum of \$364,500,000, and they give employment to six million sixty-four thousand seven hundred persons. She has invited artisans from all parts of the world by high rates of compensation, to introduce and improve manufactures; and she has attained to such perfection in linens that she has imported none from Great Britain since 1851. In cotton velvets, Russia is fast driving England out of the Chinese market, of which she formerly had exclusive possession for the sale of this article. Russian cloths chiefly supply the markets of Central Asia, while in Tartary, and Russia itself, British woolens are rarely heard of, and Russian printed cottons are said now to be equal to those of Alsace and Lancashire. (Carey's Social Science.) The exports in 1851 exceeded fifty-eight million dollars, and the imports fifty-seven million dollars; leaving, as for almost every year since the protective policy was established, in 1823, a balance in favor of Russia. By a steady adherence to this policy, from 1823 to the present time, Russia has been exempt from those commercial disasters to which we have been subjected, by vacillating legislation, and her progress has been steady and unfaltering.

According to a Senate report on the consumption of cotton in Europe, the importation of cotton yarns and manufactured goods, particularly those which are bleached or colored, into Austria, is discouraged by the imposition of duties, which are in some cases heavy, and in others absolutely prohibitive. But jealous as the Austrian government shows itself as to competition with its domestic produce of cotton yarns and twist, it is still more so with regard to the introduction of cotton fabrics and tissues; and although, says the report, it has not gone to the length that France has done, of prohibiting absolutely and in express language, their introduction within its territory, the same object is attained by the imposition of a scale of duties which are virtually prohibitive. In consequence of such duties the entire importation of all such fabrics and tissues into the whole Austrian Empire, only amounted in 1856 to 857,237 pounds of the value of \$858,295.

The German Customs Union, composed of Prussia, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Saxony, Hesse Cassel, Baden, Frankfort, Nassau, Hanover, Brunswick and Oldenburg, formed in 1833, is the latest triumph of protection; and nowhere have its effects in stimulating the growth of domestic industry been more signally demonstrated. The tariff of that confederation has always been maintained at a sufficiently high rate to sustain the developing manufactures of the country. Landed property has risen fifty to one hundred per cent. in value, within the territory of the Union, since its origin. The demand for agricultural products and their prices have largely increased, as well as the wages of labor. While the products of the Zoll-Verein looms are admitted by Dr. Bowring, the commissioner sent over by Parliament to look into the workings of the Union tariff, to be superior to those of England, they are also sold at a lower price. Such has been the progress made in the manufacture of cotton and woolen goods, that

they are now no longer imported for general use. The product of the coal mines of Prussia, the leading State of the Union, rose from 7,000,000 tons of coal in 1824 to 46,500,000 tons in 1854; while the total of her coal, iron, lead, and copper increased from 11,000,000 francs in 1824 to 159,268,220 francs in 1854. The value of the produce of the mines, smelting-works, founderies and rolling mills is 301,345,661 francs, and the number of workmen employed in them is 144,896. The progress of the woolen manufacture in Prussia since the formation of the German Customs Union, is as follows:

	No. of hand and mechanical looms.	No. of workmen.
1831.....	15,360	20,000
1846.....	34,234	47,066
1849.....	38,887	51,518

The increased wealth of the kingdom may be seen from the fact that the consumption of cloth has increased from $\frac{2}{4}$ ells per person in 1805 to $3\frac{1}{2}$ ells in 1852. That protection increases external as well as internal trade is illustrated in the importation of raw silk into the Zoll-Verein, which from 6,500 quintals in 1842 rose to 17,758 quintals in 1852; and in the importation of raw cotton, which has risen from 40,326,404 pounds in 1847, to 118,820,546 pounds in 1855. The exports of woolen goods of the Zoll-Verein in 1849 were 90,619 quintals, and in 1852 111,330 quintals. From the 76,000 tons of bar iron made in 1834, the quantity produced had increased to 200,000 tons in 1850, and the pig iron made in that year reached 600,000 tons. The present consumption of iron in the Zoll-Verein, says Mr. Carey, is fifty pounds per head per annum, an amount greater than in any country of the world, except Great Britain, the United States, France, and Belgium. The *Allgemeine Zeitung*, the leading organ of German interests, in speaking of the Union in 1841, said: "Within these ten years since protection was established, Germany has made the advance of a century in welfare and industry, in the feeling of self-dependence and national energy." In 1849, not a furnace was to be seen in the neighborhood of Minden, in Westphalia; but now, says a recent traveler, they stand like towers about a broad plain—making a vast demand for food, clothing, and labor. Of the eighty copper mines of Prussia, no less than twenty-four have been opened within the last few years. Instead of exporting wool to England to be fabricated there, and imported back in cloth, the Zoll-Verein States now import upwards of 40,000,000 pounds annually, and in 1851 they exported 12,000,000 pounds of woolen cloth. England has resorted to every kind of expedient to prevent the extension of the Union, and to change the character of its tariff, but it has all been in vain. In the quarter of a century that it has existed, it has conferred such innumerable blessings on the people of the States which compose it, has diffused such general comfort and independence throughout the country, has so much improved the condition of the laboring classes, both agricultural and mechanical, that it will be adhered to, as a permanent policy of legislation, to be reduced in rigor as the interests of the country will allow.

I might, sir, pursue this investigation further, and show from the tariffs of Spain, Denmark, and other European States, that protection, instead of being obsolete, is a living fact in all the great kingdoms of the Old World, and firmly adhered to as the sure basis of national prosperity and independence. But I have given evidence enough to refute the allegation that it has been discarded by all enlightened States and statesmen. Permit me now to refer to countries in which free trade has for a long period been the policy, and to Turkey and India in particular. Certainly

no kingdom of the Old World possesses superior natural capabilities to Turkey. Rich in useful minerals, surrounded by a long line of sea-coast, with fine ports, and with a fertile soil and various climate, she possesses all the requisites for a great commercial and manufacturing nation. These advantages are, however, neutralized by the governmental policy of the Turkish empire. A uniform tariff of five per cent. on all goods when landed, and two per cent. on their being admitted to consumption, administered by the most corrupt custom officers in the world, has almost entirely destroyed the once flourishing manufactures of the empire. While foreign imports are encouraged by this low scale of duties, a duty of twelve per cent. is imposed on exports of native production; the revenue laws being so framed as to operate against the domestic industry, and in favor of the foreign manufacturer.

The effect of this system is thus described by the free-trade writer, McCulloch :

"There can be no doubt that the native manufacturers, who produce goods not for domestic consumption, but for sale, have been involved in the greatest distress in consequence of the importation of English and other foreign goods. The manufacture of cotton yarn has been, especially, interfered with; and English cotton twist is now generally used for warp in such Turkish looms as are still at work, and is an article of increasing consumption."

The velvets and silks of Broussa and Aleppo; the muslins of Constantinople; and the crapes and gauzes of Salonica, are almost entirely superseded by similar articles from England, France, and Italy; while German cloths are rapidly taking the place of the Turkish stuffs throughout the empire. Of 600 looms at Scutari in 1812, says Urqhart, but 40 remained in 1821; and of the 2,000 weaving establishments at Tournovo in 1812, but 200 remained in 1830. Since then, the manufacture has, it is believed, entirely disappeared. Ambelakaia, which taught Montpellier the art of dyeing, and which once supplied Germany by the industry of its spindle and distaff, has been completely ruined as a seat of manufactures.

In consequence of the decay of manufactures, a large part of the population has been thrown back on agriculture for employment. For want of a home-market, the prices of products have fallen to such a degree that the agricultural laborer can only earn from eight to ten cents a day. Instead of bringing the consumer and producer together, the Turkish Government pursues a policy which forces the export of wool and cotton to distant countries to be manufactured for the use of its subjects. Agriculture has ceased to be profitable; and vast tracts, once covered with grain and cotton crops, are now turned into waste; while vessels throng the ports with grain from Odessa and other Russian ports. The constant excess of imports over exports produces such a steady drain of specie from the country, that it is deprived of any circulating medium but the debased paper of the Government, which is in such a constant state of fluctuation as to have no fixed value. The deficiency of revenue from customs is supplied by a heavy direct tax—which is the more oppressive on account of the low wages of labor, the want of steady employment, and the general poverty of the country. The Government, every year getting deeper into debt, adds to the burdens of the people; while its policy is in direct conflict with the prosperity of the country. The ancient roads have become impassable, the bridges have fallen into decay from the inability of the Government to repair them, and the transport of grain to market has become so expensive as to discourage its cultivation as an article of trade. The price of land has greatly sunk in value, so that it may be brought, in the immediate vicinity of the chief cities, for a few cents an acre. Poverty, ignorance, crime, sterility, and popular degradation and misery, are the curses that free trade have entailed on Turkey. The same results will everywhere occur from like causes.

India is in the condition that it was the aim of the British Government to keep our colonial ancestors—mere producers of raw material. Since the sway of Great Britain has been extended over British India, her policy has been to destroy the native manufactures, and to force the inhabitants to raise cotton, sugar, and indigo, for fabrication in England. The fabrics of India have been subjected to a heavy duty in England; while the import of British goods into India is free of all restriction. The export of machinery and artisans to India is prohibited; every loom is taxed, and the manufacture of salt from the extensive salt-ponds and coasts of India, is prohibited. When the native manufactures, during the independence of the different States, were flourishing, cotton was grown in immense quantities. The production was sufficiently great to supply not only the home demand, but an exportation of two hundred million pounds of cloth to other countries. With the ruin of the domestic manufactures the price declined, and the quantity raised has greatly diminished, so that the culture has been abandoned in many places once covered with cotton crops. The export of cloth has now ceased altogether, while the annual import of twist and cloth from England amounts to nearly eighty million pounds in weight.

Instead of being clad in the cheap product of their own looms, the people of India are now obliged to raise cotton at one penny a pound and send it to England to be manufactured, and pay such a price for it as will gratify the cupidity of their rulers. Says Carey :

“The power of consumption is consequently small, and the great domestic seats of manufacture, at which men, women, and children, were accustomed to combine their labors, have disappeared. Dacca, one of the principal seats of the cotton manufacture, contained ninety thousand houses; but its splendid buildings, factories, and churches, are now a mass of ruins, and overgrown with jungle.”
 * * * “With the decline of Indian manufactures, the demand for the services of women or children has ceased, and they are forced either to remain idle or to seek employment in the field; and here we have one of the distinguishing marks of a retrocession towards slavery and barbarism. The men, too, who had been accustomed to fill up the intervals of other employments, in pursuits connected with the cotton manufacture, were also driven to the field: all demand for labor, physical or intellectual, being at an end, except so far as it was required for raising indigo, sugar, cotton, or rice.”

Diminished population, diminished productiveness of the soil; the ruin of once flourishing seats of manufactures; reduction of the wages of agricultural labor to a point but one remove above starvation, owing to the decline of the price of raw cotton, sugar, and indigo; and decreased importations are the characteristics of absolute free-trade in British India, as they would be in this country, were the people of the United States mere growers of raw material, as the people of India now are.

Our ancestors were stimulated to the achievement of American independence by just such restrictions as those which have been imposed upon British India. The aim of British legislation, in the early history of this country, was to prevent the establishment of manufactures. In 1699 the British Parliament prohibited the colonies from exporting wool, yarn, or woollen fabrics, and from carrying them from one colony to another. In 1719 Parliament declared that the erection of manufactories in the colonies tended to lessen their dependence on the mother country. On complaint of the industrial progress of the colonies, by the British manufacturers, the board of trade was specially instructed to inquire into the subject. In consequence of the report of the board, in 1732, of the general extension of manufactures in the colonies, to the detriment of British interests, and the recommendation of coercive measures to restrain them, Parliament made several enactments against American industry—one prohibited the exportation of hats from the colonies, or trading in them from colony to colony; and another prohibited the erection of slitting and rolling mills and plating forges. Such was the hostility to American manufactures, at

this early period, in England, that even a liberal-minded statesman, like Lord Chatham, declared in Parliament "he would not have the Americans make a hob-nail."

These arbitrary restrictions on trade and industry exasperated the free spirit of our ancestors, manifesting, as they did, the intention of the British Government to keep them in a state of abject dependence, and thwart the development of the natural wealth of the country. National Independence became a necessity; and when it was finally won, the brave and sagacious patriots who had wielded pen and sword in its behalf, signalized their appreciation of it in one of the earliest enactments of the first Congress under the Constitution. That act, recommended by Washington and his Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, recited in its preamble that the duties therein laid were for the purpose of discharging the debts of the United States, "and for the *encouragement* and PROTECTION of manufactures." In those days, the golden era of the Republic, the protection of the labor and industry of the country was regarded as one of the first duties of the national Legislature, and the most efficient means of establishing on a firm and impregnable basis the political and industrial independence of the country. Had the visionary theories of free trade, which prevail at the present day among that class of American politicians who refuse to be instructed by the lessons of history, prevailed under the administration of Washington, the American Revolution would have been a bootless struggle, and the prospects of the nation would have been blighted in its infancy. The dependence upon Great Britain, which it was the aim of British legislation in colonial times to secure, would still have continued, and our growth and power would have been seriously retarded.

Shall we now, when the benefits of protection are stamped on every page of our history, refuse to continue the policy to which we owe so much of our wealth and prosperity, and legislate as effectually against American interests as the British Parliament did in the colonial stage of our existence? Are the insidious counsels of English writers and statesmen to be followed, to the neglect and ruin of our own interests? Shall American industry be blighted, that British manufactures may thrive? Shall this noble country of ours, with its mountains bursting with coal and iron, and rich to superabundance in the useful and precious minerals, be impoverished by our legislation, that the Old World may grow rich at our expense? If we are true to ourselves, loyal to the spirit in which the war of independence was begun and fought, and inspired by a true love of country, we will legislate for ourselves, and ourselves alone.

The abolition of all customs duties, as proposed in a report made to this body last session, by the gentleman from South Carolina, (Mr. Boyce,) would expose our immature manufacturing system to a ruinous competition with British capital and the pauper labor of Europe.

While encouragement and protection to our own manufactures would be withdrawn, such legislation would act as a powerful stimulant to British industry. It would reduce the wages of the few laborers, who could find employment in our mills and factories, to a level with those of the overworked and poorly paid operatives of Birmingham and Manchester. Foreign manufactures would be thrown upon us in such profusion as to destroy our own and European capital, and labor would have no further temptation to emigrate to this country. When, by improved processes of manufacture, we are on a footing of equality with England, and when we have accumulated capital enough to compete with that of Europe, and have established our manufactures on a firm foundation, we may throw down the barriers that now shield them from destruction; but not till then. The

inapplicability of free trade to all countries has often been admitted by the advocates of free trade in England themselves. The Hon. G. Smythe, a coöperator with Sir Robert Peel, in his scheme of free trade, in an address at Canterbury, in 1847, said :

"I cannot quit this subject of free trade without expressing my opinion on its abstract principle. I by no means hold that the principle of free trade is absolutely true, or that it is of universal application. *If I were an American, the citizen of a young country, I should be a protectionist. If I were a Frenchman, the citizen of an old country, with its industry undeveloped, I should equally be a protectionist.*"

McCulloch, the great apostle of free trade, admits in the following extract, that its universal adoption would make England what she aims to be—the workshop of the world. He says :

"Our establishments for spinning, weaving, printing, bleaching, &c., are infinitely more complete and perfect than any that exist elsewhere ; the division of labor in them is carried to an incomparably greater extent ; the workmen are trained from infancy to industrious habits, and have attained that peculiar dexterity and sleight of hand in the performance of their several tasks, that can only be attained by long and unremitted attention to the same employment. Why, then, having all these advantages on our side, should we not keep the start we have gained ? Every other people that attempt to set up manufactures must obviously labor under the greatest difficulties, as compared with us. Their establishments cannot, at first, be sufficiently large to enable the division of employments to be carried to any considerable extent. At the same time, that expertness in manipulation, and in the details of the various processes, can only be attained by slow degrees. It appears, therefore, reasonable to conclude that such new beginners, having to withstand the competition of those who have already arrived at a very high degree of perfection in the art, must be immediately driven out of every market equally accessible to both parties ; and *that nothing but the aid derived from restrictive regulations and prohibitions will be effectual to prevent the total destruction of their establishments.*"

But, we are told by the Secretary of the Treasury that duties in anywise protective operate, to the extent that they go, as a tax on the consumer. I hold, on the contrary, that such duties are a necessary means of reducing the prices of foreign manufactures. They induce the investment of capital in domestic manufactures, and thereby raise up a rival interest to compete with the foreign manufacturer. Protective duties draw capital from other investments of less public utility, and stimulate their application to industrial enterprises, giving employment to labor, and augmenting the means of living of the mechanics and operatives. They add to the wealth of the country, by the new creations of industry they call into existence ; and the temptation of profit they hold out gives rise to a healthy rivalry throughout the country. This domestic and foreign emulation redounds to the benefit of the consumer, by the progressive reduction of prices it always brings about. I challenge the advocates of free trade to produce a single article, which has had the benefit of protection for a series of years, that has not fallen greatly in price. Instead of protective duties enhancing the cost of fabrics, they have everywhere, in the United States and Europe, been the certain and only reliable means of insuring its abatement. Without protection, England would not now annually produce \$700,000,000 of manufactures, nor the United States \$1,019,106,616, giving employment to nine hundred and fifty-six thousand and fifty-nine persons, and distributing \$236,755,464 in wages per annum, employing a capital of \$533,245,351, and working up every year, taking the returns of 1850 as a criterion, \$555,123,822 of raw material. It is the welfare of one million persons, who earn their daily bread by their daily toil in our factories, forges, furnaces, and workshops, with their allies in the field, and that of their dependent families, that I appeal to you to protect from the selfish and remorseless avarice of European monopolists. This Government was founded by practical men, for practical purposes ; it was created by the people for their own benefit ; and it is false to the spirit that gave it birth, when its energies are so directed as to injure the interests it was designed to foster and protect.

If protection is a tax on the consumer, why is it that cotton goods, which cost eighty-five cents a yard before the tariff of 1816, are now sold at six to seven cents, and cotton shirtings have fallen from twenty-five cents a

yard to five; sheetings from thirty-two to seven; checks from thirty-two to eight; striped and plain gingham from twenty-six to eight; and Merri-mack prints from twenty-three cents in 1825, to nine cents in 1855? Woolen jeans, of the quality that sold in 1840 at sixty-five cents a yard, now sell at less than one-half of that price. In 1814 to 1818, says the National Magazine of June, 1845, bar iron sold in Cincinnati at \$200 to \$220 per ton; in 1845 \$100, \$105, \$110; in 1859 the price ranges between \$60 and \$80. Hammered iron, at a duty of \$22 40 per ton, sold at less than it did at a duty of nine dollars. It also, says Colton, increased the revenue from that source, which under the law of 1816, at a duty of nine dollars, was \$2,500,000; and under the law of 1828, at a duty of \$22 40, was \$5,500,000. These are by no means remarkable facts. It is the uniform operation of the protective system to cheapen the protected articles and to augment the revenue.

If there is one production which especially deserves protection from the Government, it is iron. No country in the world is so rich in iron deposits as the United States of America. These deposits are distributed through all parts of the country, in the remotest West, and in the mountains of the South, as well as in the mountain ranges that face the Atlantic sea-board of the middle and eastern States. Not a ton of foreign iron need be imported into the country, for we have raw iron enough to supply our own wants, and the most extensive foreign demand. With proper care by the Government, the iron manufacture in this country would soon be developed into gigantic proportions, and it would constitute a most important article of commerce with non-producing iron countries. In 1854, there were imported into the United States raw and manufactured iron to the value of \$31,817,564. We expended abroad that sum for an article which, under an enlightened policy, could have been produced at home. One million tons of iron are now annually produced in the United States; but it is not a tithe of what we are capable of producing, if the Government would foster domestic instead of foreign industry. No wonder that, under the free-trade tariff, financial crises are inevitable, sending, as they do, the specie out of the country in such large sums to pay for iron and other foreign articles, which we can better make at home. Under protection, the domestic productions for the most part supply our wants; we contract but little debt abroad, and the specie is retained in the country.

The wisdom of looking to our own resources, and of seeking to develop them, has been of late so forcibly presented in a leading organ of southern sentiment, the Richmond Enquirer, that I cannot forbear introducing it here, applying, as the suggestions do, to all the iron-producing States:

"Why should Virginia buy foreign iron? Why should she spend \$2,000,000 or over, annually, for iron, when she has a superabundance of it on every hand? Why should the State of Virginia pay three-fifths of that amount, even if a few impracticable individuals should think proper to encourage foreign before home industry? Is it not eminently evident—as plain as the most palpable truth could be—that the gold she sends abroad is lost, while that which she spends at home is, in reality, not spent? If she collects it from one citizen and pays it back to another, is she not as rich and as able as if it were neither collected nor paid? The wealth of the State is the wealth of the people. If the two hundred thousand tons of iron, with which our railroads are built and equipped, were made in Virginia, the \$2,000,000 which we spent for that iron would now be in circulation among us, or its equivalent, in mines, manufactures, and improvements, which would be yearly producing not only the proceeds of that vast investment, but its increase—and that would have doubled ere this.

"But if it were folly in the commencement to drain the country of its currency, it would be the consummation of that folly to preserve in that same ruinous policy. If the inducements ten years ago were sufficient on which to base the foregoing statements, is not the inducement double now? If it were better, then, to so great an extent, for Virginia to make, instead of buy, her iron, what shall we say now if she continues in her fatal policy? That very iron, for which she drained her treasury, was bought and laid down in order to open out and develop those mountains of *coals* and ores, for the purpose of producing the material at home. Those regions of mineral wealth are reached; the railroads are made; the money has been spent; but still we hesitate, and are undecided whether it is better 'to buy or make.' In vain are our splendid improvements completed; in vain our vast expenditures; and in vain, too, are the magnificent gifts of nature scattered profusely around us. We do not wonder at individuals, who are always selfish, or soulless corporations, who care little for any interest but their own. It does not astonish us that they should be blinded

to their true interest by their exclusive selfishness. They would as soon buy an iron rail from Great Britain as from Virginia, if they could save thereby a penny for the moment. But that the State should spend her millions—that Virginia should give the people's money to England—for the material which they could produce themselves, seems to us unaccountable. This is no small matter. It does not merely involve the loss of a few dollars, or a few hundred thousand, but it is a matter of millions, which still goes on. How the resources of the State can produce it, where the money is to come from, we can scarcely comprehend, unless some change is meditated. It is an annual drain on the resources of the State, which our profits do not warrant. How can we spend more than we make, without contracting debts?

"If that money, however, was spent in the State for the productions of our mountains and the labor of our people, instead of being a drain on the currency of the State, it would, on the contrary, tend to increase it. Even suppose we should pay one-third more for Virginia than for English iron, and spend \$3,000,000 instead of \$2,000,000 yearly: would we not still be the gainers of \$2,000,000 by the operation? As long as the money is in the State, it is not spent. Suppose the iron for the Virginia and Tennessee railroad was made at Lynchburg—and it could have been made, with profit, for less than its actual cost, delivered: would not the millions of dollars of gold which were sent to England for that iron now be circulating in the mountains of Virginia, and would not our manufacturers there be flourishing?"

American railroad iron has already won a high reputation for its superior quality and greater durability of wear over the English article. It is preferred both at home and abroad; and it needs but a fair rate of protection—say twelve dollars per ton, and continued as a fixed duty for a definite and reasonable period of time—to drive the English rail entirely out of the American market. The number of accidents on the great line of railway that runs through the centre of Pennsylvania, from Philadelphia to Pittsburg, from the breaking of rails, is probably less than on any railroad in the world, and it is because it is entirely laid in American iron. When a portion of that route belonged to the State, between Lancaster and Philadelphia, accidents were of frequent occurrence, from the breaking of the inferior English rail with which it was laid. The following table, from the report of the Reading railroad for 1857, of the comparative wear of the sixty-pound rail of the Phoenix Works, near Philadelphia, and the English sixty-pound rail, on that road, shows a superiority in the American rail:

	<i>Phoenix.</i>	<i>English.</i>
1850.....	4 8-10	8 3-10
1851.....	6 3-10	9 4-10
1852.....	5 9-10	12
1853.....	6 3-10	12 7-10
1854.....	5 9-10	18 8-10
1855.....	14 3-10	47
1856.....	14 6-10	37 5-10
1857.....	15 6-10	47 6-10*

A very distinguished railway engineer of Chili, South America, is referred to in the columns of the North American, of Philadelphia, as writing to a firm in that city, under date of October 14, 1858, as follows:

"I trust to be able to interest some of my friends in sending orders for iron to the States, instead of England, where we are pretty sure to get poor iron. The whole of the iron sent out to me for railway repairs on a road in Peru, which I built, and which iron came from the company, in England, that owned the road, (that is, the iron was ordered by them in England,) was not fit for the purpose. The fact is, I have been, for the past eight years, suffering from the effects of trash sent me from England. I am heartily sick of it, and will now see what I can do in the States. By this mail I send to our agent, in New York, an order for rails, chairs, and spikes, for a railway, which I shall recommend him to purchase of you."

*The last report of the Philadelphia & Baltimore railroad exhibits similar results. That report says: "that there is no question that the rails manufactured in England, in the early days of railroads, were the best that have ever been laid down; but as the demand on this side increased and the price diminished, by strong competition, the English iron rapidly degenerated, till finally, many lots were sent here, that were not worth the expense of laying down. A good portion of the material used, was from the cinder beds, and refuse of the establishments manufacturing them. About one-half of the iron for relaying the road was manufactured in England, under a guarantee of superior quality, and subject to a rigid inspection here. About 4,500 tons manufactured by Bailey, Bros. & Co., in 1851-'52, turned out to be a superior iron. A careful inspection of the condition of this iron as it now remains in the road, together with an account of the number of bars that have been taken out, shows an average deterioration of 8.63-100 per cent. per annum, or a duration equal to 11.58-100 years. The Montour, (American iron purchased in the early part of 1851,) about 1,000 tons has proved to be of a very superior quality, and exhibits a durability of 12.65-100 years. A lot of English iron from New Castle, purchased in 1854, exhibits a durability of only four and one-tenth years. For two or three years past, the report states, that only American iron has been laid down on the road, either from the Montour Works or from the establishment of Reeves, Buck, & Co., weighing fifty pounds per lineal yard, instead of iron of sixty and sixty-five pounds per yard as formerly. A saving is thus made in the material, and in first cost of 20 or 30 per cent. The quality and manufacture of the light iron is superior to the heavy iron."

Who will say that a manufacture, that under the most discouraging legislation, and at great sacrifice of capital, has attained to such a degree of excellence, does not deserve to be sustained by the Government. With twelve dollars duty per ton on foreign railroad iron, our manufacturers will, in a few years, drive their foreign rivals out of the market, by the superior quality and cheapness of their fabrics.

At the last session, sir, when there was ample time to consider the subject, and in anticipation of the present increased embarrassments of the Government, I asked leave to offer the following resolution. The requisite vote of two-thirds could not be obtained:

"Whereas the existing tariff has been found inadequate to supply the Government with revenue, and has proved itself a source of embarrassment to the trade and industry of the country: Therefore,—

Be it resolved, That the Committee of Ways and Means be instructed to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill revising the present tariff, abolishing foreign valuation, and substituting specific duties and home valuation, where necessary to retain *ad valorem* duties; and so augmenting the duties on articles coming in competition with domestic manufactures and produces, as to afford increased protection to American industry and labor."

I am glad to see now that the Administration itself admits the necessity of the revision of the tariff, advocated in this resolution—at least for purposes of revenue. There is, however, an unfortunate difference of opinion between the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. The former urges specific duties wherever practicable, and the latter advises adherence to the present mischievous foreign valuation system. Said that wise and sagacious statesman, JOHN BELL, in a speech in the Senate, last session:

"The tables of the trade of the country, and other well authenticated facts, show that the frauds committed upon the customs revenue, supposing the imports in future to be as large as they have been in the last seven years, will amount annually to a sum equal to the proposed loan, (\$15,000,000,) and even exceed that amount, if the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TOOMBS] is right in his estimate. These frauds have been practiced ever since the passage of the tariff of 1846, and chiefly in consequence of the policy of levying the duties under the act on the foreign value. It is estimated, by the honorable Senator from Georgia, that the custom-house returns do not show the real amount of importations, and that the deficiency last year was not less than one hundred million dollars. Estimating the average rate of duty under the act of 1857 on the whole amount of the imports at fifteen per cent., it will be seen that a saving could be made of the amount of proposed loan in one year, by providing a remedy against frauds in the collection of it. Another view of this subject will show results not less striking. Taking \$200,000,000 as the average amount of importations for the last ten years—and that is under the average—and further estimating \$50,000,000 as the difference between the value of the imports taken from the custom-house accounts, and the actual value annually imported, it will be seen that \$500,000,000 of foreign goods have been imported into the country in the last ten years, beyond what appears in the tables reported by the Secretary of the Treasury; and that in the same period the frauds upon the public revenue have been upwards of seventy-five million dollars."

These monstrous frauds, it might be supposed, would have deterred the Secretary from a recommendation of a continuance of the system, which enables the foreign importer by the device of double invoices, one for the custom-house, and another for the vendor, to cheat the Government annually to the amount of \$15,000,000. With a tariff of duties imposed according to the foreign valuation, it is impossible for the head of the Treasury Department to make an estimate at all approximating to accuracy of the revenue for an incoming year. The rate of duty and the amount of importations furnish no standard of calculation, as the foreign importer has it in his power, to a great degree, to fix the price of his own goods, and pay such duty as he chooses. By such a system the foreign importer himself, for the most part, determines the revenue of the country. It is demoralizing in its tendency, inviting to perjury in the false swearing necessary to sustain the fraudulent invoices. So degrading is the effect of the system on mercantile character, that it is rapidly driving the high-minded, honorable American merchant out of the foreign trade, and delivering it into the hands of unscrupulous foreigners. As a natural consequence, it is stated, that three-fourths of the foreign trade of the country is now in the hands of foreigners, their agents, or factors. Injurious as is foreign valuation to the Government, it is equally so to the industry of the country. The rate of protection is perpetually fluctuating under foreign valuation,

and when most needed, under the low prices ruling abroad, it is the least effective. When prices are high in Europe, there is but little danger of an excessive importation, and such duties then serve but little purpose in the way of protection.

A committee of the British Parliament, in 1852, instituted a laborious inquiry into the working of *ad valorem* duties, and they reported "that conclusive evidence had been furnished them, both by merchants and officers of customs, that these duties, however good in theory, operate badly in practice." It was in evidence before them, that there was an utter impossibility of their ever working correctly, and that they would always be a subject of annoyance and vexation, favoritism, and bribery; and that they ought to be converted, as far as at all possible, into specific duties; and in many cases where this could not be done, they should be abolished. One of the principal objections to the system, in the opinion of most competent and experienced witnesses, was the difficulty of fixing the value of the article imported. The facility of committing fraud under *ad valorem* duties is fully manifested in a report of the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress in 1843. It is there shown that frauds and perjuries had been systematically perpetrated on the revenue by this means, for a series of years, by foreign importers and their agents, in collusion with custom-house officers. The frauds detected, however, formed but a very small part of those actually committed, and which had escaped punishment. One British importer, John Taylor, jr., with the aid of a custom officer, of the name of Campbell, in the course of twenty-one months, committed frauds to the amount of \$200,000.

The proposed introduction of *ad valorem* duties into the tariff of 1846, called forth the following earnest remonstrance to the Senate of the United States, from all the importing dry-goods merchants of Boston :

"The undersigned, your memorialists, would respectfully represent that they are importers of foreign goods into the city of Boston, and as such they have examined with alarm and consternation, the bill recently passed by the House of Representatives to change, in a great measure, our system of collecting duties on imports. Should the bill referred to become a law of the land, we are fully convinced that we shall be compelled to abandon our business into the hands of unscrupulous foreigners, who have little or no regard to our custom-house oaths. From long experience, we are fully satisfied that we cannot compete with this class, when duties are based merely on the *ad valorem* principle."

The apprehensions and predictions of the remonstrants have been realized, even to a more disastrous extent than they ever conceived it possible. The Secretary of the Treasury, in 1818, William H. Crawford, said :

"The certainty with which specific duties are collected give them a decided advantage over duties laid upon the value of the article. It is probable that the most important change which can be made in the system, will be the substitution of specific for *ad valorem* duties, upon all articles susceptible of that change."

The present President of the United States said in the Senate in 1842 :

"Our *ad valorem* system has produced great frauds upon the revenue, while it has driven the regular American merchant from the business of importing, and placed it almost exclusively in the hands of the agents of British manufacturers. The American importer produces his invoice to the collector, containing the actual price at which the imports were collected abroad, and he pays the regular and fair duty upon this invoice. Not so the British agent. The foreign manufacturer, in his invoice, reduces the price of the articles which he intends to import in our country, to the lowest possible standard which he thinks will enable them to pass through the custom-house without being seized for fraud. And the business has hitherto been managed with so much ingenuity as to escape detection. The consequence is, that the British agent passes the goods of his employer through the custom-house, on the payment of a much lower rate of duty than the fair American merchant is compelled to pay. In this manner he is undersold in the market by the foreigner, and thus is driven from the competition, while the public revenue is fraudulently reduced."

I need discuss this branch of the subject no further. Our own experience, as well as that of all other nations, is against *ad valorem* duties, both on the ground of revenue and commercial morality. That the Secretary of the Treasury should persist in adhering to them, at a time when the revenue falls \$30,000,000 short of the expenditure, and with a knowledge of the fact that they are concentrating the foreign trade in the hands of foreigners, is as astonishing as his constantly recurring mistakes in reve-

nue estimates. If the tariff is to be revised, it is to be desired in every point of view that as many specific duties as possible should be introduced into it.

That the tariff must be revised, if for no other purpose than for revenue, is, to my mind, as clear as the noonday sun. The expenditures of the Government, amounting, as they do, to \$80,000,000, require a much larger revenue than is yielded by the present tariff. It has been tested sufficiently to show its inadequacy to the wants of the Treasury. The receipts of customs for the year ending June last, were \$41,789,721, against \$63,875,905 in 1856-'57. For the current year they cannot rise to much more than fifty million. The Government is now \$64,000,000 in debt. We must either plunge deeper into debt by borrowing, to meet the accruing deficiency, or we must raise the duties, and increase the income of the Government, so as to enable it to meet its current expenses, and provide a surplus fund for the extinction of the debt. With the reckless prodigality that distinguishes the present Administration, it is easy to foresee that it will close its career with a debt of over one hundred millions. Instead of proposing schemes of retrenchment, we have the monstrous project of raising \$30,000,000, to be placed at the disposal of the President, for the purchase of Cuba, who, for that purpose, is to be invested with the sword and purse, which the Constitution never contemplated taking away from Congress—their legal depository. We have fallen on evil times, when, in this early stage of the Republic, we are called on to divest Congress of its constitutional attributes, and to clothe the President of the United States with the absolute powers of a Roman dictator.

The gentleman who told us that protection was obsolete, also said that it had fallen under the ban of all the leading scientific writers of the age. He is as wide of the mark in the last assertion as in the first. The chief object of protection is to develop the home trade, and in this it has the sanction of the apostle of free trade, Adam Smith himself. He says:

"The greatest and most important branch of the commerce of every nation, it has already been observed, is that which is carried on between the inhabitants of the town and those of the country. The inhabitants of the town draw from the country the rude produce which constitutes both the materials of their work and the fund of their subsistence; and they pay for this produce by sending back to the country a certain portion of it manufactured and prepared for immediate use. The trade which is carried on between these two sets of people, consists ultimately in a certain quantity of rude produce exchanged for a certain quantity of manufactured produce. *Whatever tends to diminish, in any country, the number of artificers and manufacturers, tends to diminish the home market, the most important of all markets, for the rude produce of the land, and thereby still further to discourage agriculture.* Those systems therefore, which, preferring agriculture to all other employments, in order to promote it, impose restraints on manufactures and foreign trade, act contrary to the very end which they propose, and indirectly discourage that very species of industry which they mean to produce."

No better argument for protection can be adduced than this, and no better illustration of the benefits conferred on agriculture by the encouragement of manufactures. To say nothing of eminent protectionist writers in France, Italy, and England, I challenge the production from among the writers on political economy of a more learned, philosophical, and convincing speculator on that theme, than my distinguished fellow-citizen, Henry C. Carey. The works he has published in support of the protective policy are remarkable for profound research, extensive range of inquiry, rare logical acumen, and a consummate knowledge of history. His recent volumes on "The Principles of Social Science," place him in the front rank of political economists, and side by side with Adam Smith himself, whose doctrines are elaborated into a most satisfactory justification of the protective policy. These volumes do honor to the age and country in which they have been produced, and are worthy of the enthusiastic welcome they have received from enlightened thinkers on both sides of the Atlantic. They deserve to be studied as text-books in our colleges, as pointing out the true road to national greatness, and moral and political independence.

When I rose, sir, it was chiefly with the view of combating the attacks which have been made in this Hall on the protective policy. Did my time allow, I could easily show that the causes of the late crisis are not to be traced to bank speculations, as the President would have us believe, but to radical errors in our tariff legislation. Debarred of this opportunity, I shall here close my argument. The views that I have this day advanced, are those entertained by the great statesmen who laid the foundations of this Republic; by Washington, Jefferson, Hamilton, Madison, Clay, Jackson, and others. Historical facts confirm their truth, and cotemporary experience warns us to return to the policy with which the growth, wealth, and political power of all modern States is identified. In this Hall, I shall never consent to legislate for the interests of any country but my own, or further any scheme of legislation which strikes down American capital and labor.

I hope to see the time when the liberal men of all parties will recognize the protection of the productive forces of the nation as the most important question of American politics; and when, sundering all other party ties, they will unite in its support to such an extent as to secure its ascendancy as the permanent policy of the country. Such a party, composed of men acting under a sympathetic, patriotic feeling, exists in Pennsylvania, under the name of the "People's Party." Its platform is broad enough to cover the interests of all sections of the Union—its spirit is thoroughly national, knowing no North, no South, no East, no West. Looking to the good of the whole people, it addresses itself to the sympathies of the whole people; it appeals to patriotic impulses, not to sectional prejudices; it aims, not to divide the Union into hostile States, to be eventually consumed by the flames of civil war, but to bind together with links of adamant the weakened bonds of the Confederacy, and to make us once again a harmonious, united people. I impugn the patriotism of no party; but I protest against the narrow rule of political action laid down by the gentleman from Maine, (Mr. WASHBURN.)

In my view, the question of labor, and remunerative employment for those who toil in the field at the forge and furnace, and drive the loom and shuttle, rises superior to all others. I protest against the imputations in the speech of that gentleman upon the convention which met here during the last month, to devise a plan by which the whole Opposition might unite against the ruinous doctrines of the Democratic party. The object of that convention was just and patriotic, and dictated by considerations of high public duty. I regret to hear such a generous purpose denounced as if it were a paltry political scheme, derogatory to its participators, and treasonable to the country. No member of the Opposition has a right to throw a stumbling block in the way of its perfect union; and he who does, in my opinion, impeaches his own good judgment and patriotism. Without seeking to erect an exclusive party standard, as the text of political orthodoxy, or to tear down or build up parties, I hope to see all the elements of the Opposition thoroughly fused into an omnipotent combination, which shall secure the triumph of the true friends of the country, and of principles with which the existence of the Union and the prosperity of the country are inseparably blended. Such a desired end can only be obtained by liberality of feeling, toleration of variant views, and a generous spirit of conciliation; such as marked the men of various faiths and races, who stood shoulder to shoulder in the ranks of the liberating army of the Revolution, and sacrificed the prejudices of section, birth, and creed, on the altar of their common country.